DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 704 CE 033 844

AUTHOR Kim, Yungho; Wright, Calvin E.
TITLE An Evaluation of Vocational Education Act Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations in California. 1977-78 and 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Vocational Education Services.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 70p.; Prepared under Standard Agreement No. 0039.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Disadvantaged; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; Postsecondary Education; Program Improvement; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Services; *State Federal Aid; State Programs; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS California; *Vocational Education Amendments 1976

ABSTRACT

A study examined the activities and the impact of allocations made under Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Supportive Services) and Subpart 4 (Special Programs for the Disadvantaged) of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. Covered by the study were 1,352 allocations made to California secondary school districts and 520 allocations made to California community college districts in 1977-78 and 1978-79. To obtain these data, researchers analyzed the results of questionnaires completed by administrators of 448 community college districts and 1,284 secondary school districts. Data revealed that because funding approval often came too late, both secondary school and community college school districts failed to spend the full budgeted amounts approved for them. Frequently, local education agencies used allocated funds for routine operations rather than for program improvement or for special programs. Furthermore, evidence from financial records was frequently vague, questionable, and inaccurate. Recommendations included calls for development of guidelines concerning the use of Subpart 3 and 4 allocation funds, for further investigation of the precise use of funds, and for review of the intent of the allocation system. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

82-442-06

ED221704

Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc.
250 S. CASTANYA WAY
MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA 94025
(415) 325-3254

AN EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT SUBPART 3 AND 4 ALLOCATIONS IN CALIFORNIA 1977-78 and 1978-79

Yungho Kim and Calvin E. Wright

Prepared for
Vocational Education Unit
California State Department of Education
and
The Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

August 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This study was supported by Public Law 94-482 funds through a contract with the State of California Department of Education, Standard Agreement No. 0039. The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

CE 033 844

PREFACE

Regulations implementing the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) require an evaluation in quantitative terms of the effectiveness of each formally organized program or project supported by federal, state, and local funds. Such evaluation is to include instructional programs as well as legislative purpose programs.

Since 1977-78 community college and secondary school districts have been receiving allocations of funds for program improvement and supportive services (Subpart 3) and for special programs for the disadvantaged (Subpart 4). The study reported here was the first to evaluate the impact of these allocations. It was carried out for the Vocational Education Unit of the California State Department of Education and for the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.

Hundreds of individuals throughout the state provided information for this study. The findings and conclusions were enhanced through the efforts of five consultants, each of whom was a knowledgeable expert with experience in either California secondary schools or community colleges. They were: E. David Graf, who for many years was an administrator in the Vocational Education Unit of the State Department of Education; John Cavanagh, a former director of vocational education who served as an administrator for a number of years at Grossmont Union High School District; Charles E. Buckton, a long time administrator at Visalia Unified School District who has also served as a consultant in evaluation for the Vocational Education Unit; Glenn Van Noy, who recently retired from Laney College where he served a number of years as Director of Occupational Education; and Irvin Colt, who recently retired from Mt. San Antonio College where he was Director of Occupational Education and who was formerly president of the California Community Colleges Administrators of Occupational Education. The project was monitored by Dr. Ernest R. Neasham in the Department of Education and by Dr. William Morris in the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges. They provided suggestions and guidance throughout the study, and reviewed and commented on the draft of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was conducted to describe the activities and determine the impact of allocations made under Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Supportive Services) and Subpart 4 (Special Programs for the Disadvantaged) of Public Law 94-482, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. The study covered 1,352 allocations made to California secondary school districts and 520 allocations made to California community college districts in 1977-78 and 1978-79. These allocations amounted to $10.3 million. The significance of this study for vocational education was the production of information that was needed by state staff to meet the accountability requirements of P.L. 94-482 and to better understand the implications of the use of an allocation system to distribute resources for legislative purpose programs.

A survey of LEAs was conducted using questionnaires to collect information on activities supported by the allocations and on their impact. Subsequent visits were made to 20 selected sites to verify outcomes of allocation expenditures. Details of the method used and specific results are given in the main text of this report. Major conclusions and the recommendations presented in the main text are summarized below.

Allocation Expenditures

Secondary school and community college districts frequently did not spend the full budgeted amounts approved for them. This often occurred because funding approval came too late. Problems develop and impact is lessened when activities do not start at the beginning of a school year.

- It is recommended that state staff do everything possible to try to make allocations and complete the appropriate approval process so that programs and services can start at the beginning of a school year.

Activities That Were Funded

For Subpart 3, the activities most frequently carried out at secondary schools as well as community colleges were providing student counseling and guidance services, and providing workshops or conferences for personnel training. For Subpart 4, the most frequently carried out activities were: providing aides or tutors for student instruction, providing instructional services to students, and obtaining or developing materials for student instruction.

Generally, LEAs used the allocated funds to support activities to meet local needs. However, funds often appeared to be used for routine operations

rather than for program improvement or special programs. In some cases it seemed as if the money largely lost its identity and was used for general expenses of operating or maintaining the educational program in the post Proposition 13 era.

There was little consistency from one LEA to the next when funds were spent to purchase equipment in conjunction with carrying out some of the activities. Some LEAs appeared to have purchased equipment for use by all students or all vocational education students, rather than to help handicapped, LES, or disadvantaged students succeed in their vocational education classes.

- It is recommended that both the Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges issue to their districts detailed guidelines concerning the use of Subpart 3 and 4 allocation funds for equipment purchase. These guidelines should be specific for each legislative purpose.

Individuals who completed the questionnaires often had little direct or first-hand knowledge of specific allocation activities. Questionnaire information was sometimes incomplete and of questionable validity. Also, evidence from records was frequently vague, suspicious, and sometimes inaccurate. Little confidence could, therefore, be placed in what was reported. This situation would probably have been different had the evaluation been carried out soon after the allocated funds were claimed.

Members of the site visit teams were not auditors, nor were financial records inspected. However, members of the site visit teams sometimes suspected that allocated funds were being used to supplant other funds, especially in the area of student counseling and guidance services.

- It is recommended that the Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office initiate a special study to specifically investigate the extent to which funds allocated from Subpart 3 and Subpart 4 were used to supplant rather than supplement other funds.

Allocation Outcomes and Impact

A number of short-term and lasting effects were attributed to the allocations by LEA staff. However, the effects attributed to an allocation were often the result of activities supported by multiple sources of funds. Reported effects were mostly based upon LEA staff opinion rather than upon specific evidence, which was usually lacking. What little evidence of effects that was available was often in the form of testimony which did not necessarily hold up under in-depth investigation.

Persons responsible for answering for the allocated funds often had little

or no evidence about the characteristics of those who received benefits. Although a large number of vocational education students and LEA personnel were reported as having benefited from the allocations, the number of student beneficiaries is probably greatly exaggerated.

In spite of problems noted above, it is apparent that the allocations had impact on vocational education. As might be expected, in terms of individual allocations the impact was primarily local. However, through the allocations collectively it is also apparent that there was statewide impact, although the specific extent of the impact is probably debatable.

The Allocation Process and Accountability

Although the allocations had impact, in terms of the total funds spent it is not clear whether or not the overall impact would have been greater had the funds been used for additional special projects addressing specified priorities.

- It is recommended that the Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office review the intent of the allocation system in the light of what was found in this study, and attempt to clarify the similarities and differences in the intents of both the allocation system and the special projects program. It is also recommended that, on the basis of this review, consideration be given to whether overall impact might be maximized by modifying the proportion of funds budgeted for allocations and for special projects.

In order to improve accountability and the potential impact of funds for the purposes for which they are intended, one of two courses of action would appear reasonable. One is to improve the current allocation system, while the other is to substitute a somewhat different system of distributing funds for it. One alternate approach has been suggested on page 39 of the main text of this report. Such a system could still provide funds to meet local needs, but accountability should be improved substantially.

- It is recommended that the Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office seriously consider the pros and cons of substituting a different system of distributing funds for the current allocation system in order to maximize the impact of the funds for the purposes for which they are intended.

Allocations that are too small are in most cases a waste of money and not worth local clerical and administrative effort.

- It is recommended that minimal amounts to be allocated to an LEA be reconsidered in terms of administrative and accountability costs, and that different minima be considered for each legislative purpose category as appropriate.

One reason that LEA staff were not able to provide more credible information was that they had not been informed that the allocations would be evaluated, and so were unprepared.

- Until the state is no longer required to evaluate in quantitative terms the effectiveness of each legislative purpose program, it is recommended that LEAs be notified that such an evaluation will be routine and may involve a site visit.

Some recommendations to improve the current allocation system have been given above. Other recommendations to improve the system and future evaluations of Subpart 3 and 4 allocations are as follows. It should be noted that accountability requires specificity, a theme that runs through many of the recommendations given in this report.

- It is recommended that LEAs be given more specific guidelines about how the funds for each legislative purpose category allocation can be spent, and the types of activities that can be supported.

- It is recommended that Department of Education and Chancellor's Office applications for allocations and related instructions be further improved so that better descriptions of objectives and planned activities or tasks are given by LEAs.

- It is recommended that secondary school districts be asked to submit an accountability report with each final claim for Subpart 3 or 4 funds, and that a prototype of the report be provided when the allocations are made. The accountability report should be designed to provide most, if not all, of the information needed for the evaluation of legislative purpose programs.

- It is recommended that the annual accountability report currently required of community college districts be further improved so that it can be a vehicle for providing most, if not all, of the information needed for the evaluation of legislative purpose programs.

- It is also recommended that, until information to evaluate the legislative purpose programs can be obtained from routinely submitted accountability reports, such programs continue to be evaluated using a questionnaire as a major data collection instrument with verification visits to selected sites.

Improvement of Future Evaluations

During the site visits LEA staff were asked their opinions as to what information districts should be asked to report so that local impact on vocational and occupational education can be determined. The most frequent response was that the information requested on the questionnaire and during the site visits was reasonable. However, most districts did not keep records of student

beneficiaries by sex or racial/ethnic classification, reporting instead data from enrollment reports.

- It is recommended that for future evaluations of the impact of Subpart 3 and 4 allocations, districts be asked to provide essentially the same type of information requested for 1977-78 and 1978-79. However, information on student beneficiaries broken down by sex and racial/ethnic classification should not be requested until after districts have been notified in advance that such information will need to be collected and reported.

In addition to this recommendation, suggestions for the improvement of future evaluations of Subpart 3 and 4 allocations have been included in the main text of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
Executive Summary	ii
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	viii
Introduction	1
Background	1
Purpose and Objectives	2
Approach and Products of the Study	3
Method	4
Compile Data Base and Prepare Directory	4
Develop Questionnaires	4
Conduct Survey	5
Conduct Verification Visits	6
Analyze Data and Report Results	7
Results	8
Number of Allocations and Expenditures	8
Activities Supported by the Allocations	11
Activities Which Would Not Have Been Possible	16
Short-Term and Lasting Effects of the Allocations	18
Beneficiaries of the Allocations	23
Credibility of Information Provided	28
Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	32
Allocation Expenditures	33
Activities That Were Funded	34
Allocation Outcomes and Impact	37
The Allocation Process and Accountability	39
Improvement of Future Evaluations	42
Appendix A: Questionnaire Used for 1977-78 Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students Allocations	45
Appendix B: Supplementary Tables	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number of Secondary School Districts that had Approved Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations, Claimed Federal Funds, and Responded to the Survey	9
2	Number of Community College Districts that had Approved Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations, Claimed Federal Funds, and Responded to the Survey	10
3	Approved Federal Budgets and Funds Claimed for Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations	11
4	Similarity of Activities Proposed and Reported as Completed by Districts That Were Visited	16
5	Secondary School Activities Which Respondents Said Would Not Have Been Possible Without the Allocations	17
6	Community College Activities Which Respondents Said Would Not Have Been Possible Without the Allocations	19
7	Short-term Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Secondary School Districts	20
8	Short-term Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Community College Districts	21
9	Lasting Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Secondary School Districts	23
10	Lasting Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Community College Districts	24
11	Number of Secondary School Vocational Education Students Reported as Benefiting from the Allocations	25
12	Number of Community College Vocational Education Students Reported as Benefiting from the Allocations	26
13	Number of District, School, and College Personnel Reported as Benefiting from the Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations	27
14	Credibility Ratings Assigned to Questionnaire Responses for Sites That Were Visited	29

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation study was conducted to describe the activities supported in California secondary school and community college districts by allocations of funds under Subparts 3 and 4 of P.L. 94-482. It was also conducted to determine the outcomes of the supported activities in terms of their local and state impact on vocational education.

Background

Section 104.402 of the regulations implementing the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) states, in part, that:

> "The State board shall, during the five-year period of the State plan, evaluate in quantitative terms the effectiveness of each formally organized program or project supported by Federal, State, and local funds."

On April 24, 1979, the Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational, Technical and Manpower Education in the U.S. Office of Education issued a policy memorandum on P.L. 94-482 evaluation requirements. Portions of this memorandum read as follows:

> "Program (or project) is defined to include instructional programs as well as legislative purpose programs. An instructional program is a planned sequence of courses, services, or activities designed to meet an occupational objective. These programs are defined by the OE six-digit codes... A legislative purpose program is a course, service, or method of instruction which does not necessarily provide vocational skill training as a primary focus, but which is formally organized by the State in response to legislative priorities.
>
> "Any program that can feasibly be included as a six-digit program should be evaluated and reported as such. In the legislative purpose programs... which cannot be identified with a single six-digit code, it is important that these programs be appropriately evaluated and reported under their legislative purpose."

Through systems such as PAVE, COPES, FUSE, AND SAM, the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges have made provisions for the evaluation of instructional programs. Efforts have also been undertaken to evaluate legislative purpose programs, such as a third-party evaluation of special projects funded under Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Supportive Services) and Subpart 5 (Consumer and Homemaking Education) of the regulations.

Since 1977-78 community college and secondary school districts in California have been receiving allocations of funds under Subpart 3 and Subpart 4 (Special

Programs for the Disadvantaged) for various legislative purpose programs. The legislative purpose categories for Subpart 3 included Local Administration, Vocational Guidance and Counseling, Vocational Education Personnel Training, Sex Bias and Stereotyping, Disadvantaged Students, Limited English Speaking Students, and Handicapped Students. During 1977-78 and 1978-79 there were 1,872 allocations made to LEAs. The impact of these allocations had not been evaluated.

In keeping with its management responsibilities and its obligations under the law mentioned above, the Vocational Education Unit of the Department of Education issued a Request for Proposals in March of 1981 to conduct an impact study of the Subpart 3 and 4 allocations made in 1977-78 and 1978-79. Subsequently a contract was awarded to Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., (EERI). This evaluation study was carried out under the close supervision of the Vocational Education Unit and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this evaluation study was to describe the activities supported by Subpart 3 and 4 allocations and to determine the outcomes of the supported activities in terms of their local and state impact on vocational education. The allocations of concern were the 1,872 allocations made to LEAs in 1977-78 and 1978-79.

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. Where possible, LEA expenditures will be attributed to each agency category (secondary schools and community colleges), and comparisons will be made by year for each agency category and for each legislative purpose.
2. A description of each activity partially or fully funded by each claimed allocation will be obtained and activities will be classified by category for each legislative purpose and will be reported by year.
3. Community college and secondary school districts will be asked to identify activities that were carried out which would not have been possible without the allocation.
4. A determination will be made of what short-term and lasting effects were attributable to the allocations. (Lasting effects are those which lasted beyond the funding period.)
5. Where possible, information will be obtained and reported as to the

characteristics of faculty personnel and vocational and occupational students who received benefits from allocation expenditures. (Characteristics of concern are: disadvantaged, handicapped, or limited English speaking; ethnic classification; sex; and educational status--faculty, counselor, etc.).

6. The credibility of information provided by LEAs will be determined by examining the evidence and testimonies available at LEAs.

7. Recommendations will be made for the improvement of future evaluations of Subparts 3 and 4 allocations in terms of what information should be required by division regulations to determine local impact on vocational and occupational education.

Approach and Products of the Study

Five major tasks were undertaken in this study. First, a directory of allocations was compiled based on information obtained from the State Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges. Questionnaires were then developed to collect information on activities supported by the allocations and on their impact. A survey of LEAs was conducted using the questionnaires. Subsequent visits were made to 20 selected sites in order to verify outcomes of allocation expenditures. Information from all sources was then analyzed and summarized in the preparation of this report. Greater detail about the method and procedures used in the study is presented in the Method section below.

The major products of the study are this final report and a completed questionnaire for each allocation describing the activities carried out with the funds. The significance of this study for vocational education was the production of information that was needed by state staff to meet the accountability requirements of P.L. 94-482 and to better understand the implications of the use of an allocation system to distribute resources for legislative purpose programs.

METHOD

This section reports on the five major tasks carried out to complete the evaluation study: compile base data and prepare directory, develop questionnaires, conduct survey, conduct verification visits, and analyze data and report results.

Compile Base Data and Prepare Directory

The first step for this task was to design a form to be used for recording base data from the Fiscal Files of the Exceptional Education Unit. The base data for each allocation made included: name of recipient, year of allocation, legislative purpose, amount of federal funds allocated and approved, and amount of federal funds claimed.

Arrangements were made with staff from the Exceptional Education Unit of the California State Department of Education to obtain these base data. The data collection and recording work was done on-site at the Exceptional Education Unit in Sacramento, since the files were subject to audit at any time and could not be taken from the building. The data were picked out from various claim fund forms (SE-65A-S, SE-65A-P) and from computer printouts of Exceptional Education System Expenditure Reports. It was necessary to work with the claim forms because the computer printouts did not show an allocation if no claims were made against that particular allocation. It was found that a total of 1,805 allocations were made during 1977-78 and 1978-79, while claims were made for 1,760 allocations.

The second step for the first task was to prepare a directory of allocations and respondents. It would have been preferable to identify ahead of time the names of those individuals who actually carried out the activities supported by the funds. However, such information was not available from the applications for funds or from other documents. Therefore, the most up-to-date names of district superintendents were obtained. Also, LEA addresses and telephone numbers were obtained from the most recent California School Directory. This information was transcribed onto the recording forms. The set of complete recording forms thus constituted the directory of allocations and respondents. This directory was used for questionnaire mailing and follow-up activities.

Develop Questionnaires

A separate questionnaire was developed for each of the appropriate legislative purpose categories. They were, however, quite similar except for the

headings and wording of instructions. Each questionnaire had three pages and 11 questions.

The questionnaires were tried out on the state advisors and on five knowledgeable consultants recommended by the state advisors. Each reviewer was asked to play the role of a respondent and give an answer to each question. Each was also asked to tell what was meant by the question, and to make comments on whether it was a reasonable question to ask potential respondents. The questionnaires were revised based on these pretest results and on the comments made by members of the Department of Education Data Acquisitions Subcommittee. The questionnaires were then printed in two different colors to differentiate the two years involved. A copy of the questionnaire used for 1979-80 Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students allocations is shown in Appendix A.

Conduct Survey

The first step for this task was to mail out the 1,850 questionnaires to 800 secondary school districts and 50 community college districts. All questionnaires were sent to the district superintendents, with a covering letter signed by a Department of Education or Chancellor's Office official. The letter asked that the superintendents pass each questionnaire on to the member of his or her staff currently most knowledgeable about the activities supported by the allocation. A separate cover letter, with a prepaid return envelope, was attached to each questionnaire to explain to the respondent the purpose of the study and to request cooperation.

The second step for this task was to provide for receipt control and conduct follow-up activities. Procedures were developed to keep track of the returned questionnaires and telephone calls made or received.

Approximately two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed, a reminder postcard was sent to each district superintendent asking that the questionnaires be returned. Approximately two weeks after the reminder postcard was sent, ESEA staff called the districts from which all questionnaires had not been received. When requested by the districts during the phone calls, additional questionnaires were mailed to replace those "never received" or "misplaced." Also, a time extension was given when requested. For the community college districts, 98% of the 100 questionnaires sent were returned (98%), while for secondary school districts 1,386 of the 1,750 questionnaires sent were received (79%).

Content Verification Visits

Site visits were made to verify outcomes of allocation expenditures. This included validating that the activities reported on the questionnaire were actually carried out, and that reported products were actually generated. In essence, the visits were to verify questionnaire data in order to determine how much confidence could be placed in what was reported.

Visits were made to 10 community college districts and 10 secondary school districts. The sites to be visited were selected by the two state monitors, one from the Vocational Education Unit of the California State Department of Education, and one from the Division of Occupational Education of the California Community Colleges. A letter notifying staff at the selected sites about the visits was sent from either the California State Department of Education or from the Chancellor's office of the California Community Colleges.

Guidelines for verifying questionnaire responses were developed, as was a rating form. Prior to a site visit, the appropriate questionnaires were reviewed following the guidelines, and notes were made on the questionnaires. These notes, plus the rating form, were used to guide the actual site visit. Each visit was for one day, and was made by an EDD representative and a community college or secondary school consultant recommended by the state monitors. At the end of each visit, the EDD representative and the consultant jointly evaluated the information obtained through observation, document review, and interviews with knowledgeable individuals. Based on this information, a rating was given regarding the degree of confidence one could place in the reported questionnaire data.

Each of the five consultants who served on a number of each site visit team was a knowledgeable expert with experience in either California secondary schools or community colleges. They were: E. David Graf, who for many years was an administrator in the Vocational Education Unit of the State Department of Education; John Cavanagh, a former director of vocational education who served as an administrator for a number of years at Grossmont Union High School District; Charles E. Buxton, a long time administrator at Visalia Unified School District who has also served as a consultant in evaluation for the Vocational Education Unit; Glenn Van Ray, who recently retired from Laney College where he served a number of years as Director of Occupational Education; and Irvin Colt, who recently retired from Mt. San Antonio College where he was Director of Occupational Education and who was a former president of the California Community Colleges Administrators of Occupational Education.

Analyze Data and Report Results

There were three different kinds of data to be analyzed: the base data obtained mainly from state files, the description of allocation activities and impact data obtained through the questionnaires, and the confidence ratings and other data obtained during the site visits. The analyses of these data were mostly dictated by the objectives of the study. All analyses were done separately by type of institution (secondary and community college).

The first objective of the study was addressed by tabulating the base data. Allocation expenditures were added by type of institution, legislative purpose, and fiscal year. However, the expenditures could not be tied to activities, because such data were not available in state or LEA files.

In order to meet the second objective of the study, activity categories were determined based on the types of activities specified in the federal regulations and priorities given in The California Five-Year State Plan for Vocational Education. Using these activity categories, each activity described in the questionnaire was classified into one of the categories, which were then tallied by legislative purpose. Questionnaire responses on the activities that would not have been possible without an allocation were also tabulated for each legislative purpose to meet the third objective.

To meet the fourth objective, questionnaire responses on short-term and lasting effects which were attributed to the allocations were analyzed. This involved identifying types of effects, then tabulating the responses according to the identified types. Also, questionnaire responses on the number of vocational students and personnel who benefited from the allocations were analyzed to meet the fifth objective of the study. In order to meet the sixth objective, the credibility ratings obtained during the site visits were analyzed. In addition, for the LEAs that were visited activities reported on the questionnaires were compared with the activities initially proposed in the applications for funds. All the results are presented in this final report.

RESULTS

The results of this study are presented in six sections, each corresponding to an objective of the study. Within each section, results are presented for secondary school and community college districts separately.

Many of the tables included below present results separately for 1977-78 and for 1978-79, the two years covered by this study. However, comparisons between the two years should be made cautiously. In 1978-79, districts submitted specific applications for Subpart 3 funds. Such applications were not required for 1977-78, when a portion of the funds approved for Subpart 2 (The Basic Grant) were earmarked for Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students, LEP Students, and Handicapped Students. In addition, Subpart 3 allocations were for only three legislative purposes in 1977-78, but for seven purposes in 1978-79. For these reasons districts probably had fewer options as to what they could spend the funds for in 1977-78 compared with 1978-79.

Number of Allocations and Expenditures

As mentioned in the Method section before, the information on the number of Subpart 3 and 4 allocations and on expenditures was obtained from computer listings and fiscal files in Sacramento. Table 1 shows the number of secondary school districts that had approved Subpart 3 and 4 allocations and the number that claimed funds. Also shown is the number of allocations for which claims were made and questionnaires were returned. For 1977-78, the largest numbers of secondary school district Subpart 3 allocations were for Disadvantaged Students and Handicapped Students. The total number of Subpart 3 and 4 allocations was 635, for which 571 claims were made (90%). For 1978-79, the largest numbers of allocations were for Vocational Guidance and Counseling and for Vocational Education Personnel Training. A total of 717 Subpart 3 and 4 allocations were made, for which 675 claims were made (94%).

Table 2 shows the number of community college districts that had approved Subpart 3 and 4 allocations and the number that claimed funds. The number of allocations for which claims were made and questionnaires were returned is also shown. For 1977-78, most of the community college districts had Subpart 3 allocations for Disadvantaged Students, LEP Students, and Handicapped Students. A total of 225 Subpart 3 and 4 allocations were made, for which 210 claims were submitted (93%). For 1978-79, the largest number of allocations were for Vocational Guidance and Counseling, Disadvantaged Students, and Handicapped Students. The total number of Subpart 3 and 4 allocations was 295, for which 284 claims were made (96%).

Table 1

Number of Secondary School Districts that had Approved Subpart 3 and 5 Allocations, Claimed Federal Funds, and Responded to the Survey

Year and Allocation Purpose	Had Approved Allocations	Claimed Federal Funds	Claimed Funds and Returned Questionnaire
1977-78 Subpart 3			
Disadvantaged Students	241	223	219
LEP Students	58	52	50
Handicapped Students	205	219	213
1977-78 Subpart 5			
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	61	61	60
Sum, 1977-78	435	371	342
1978-79 Subpart 3			
Local Administration[a]	40	46	46
Voc. Guidance and Counseling	190	183	187
Gen. Ed. Personnel Training	173	171	170
Sex Bias and Stereotyping[a]	6	40	9
Disadvantaged Students	137	119	110
LEP Students	21	17	16
Handicapped Students	108	111	105
1978-79 Subpart 5			
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	58	56	52
Sum, 1978-79	717	673	630

[a]The number of districts that claimed funds and returned a questionnaire exceeded the number that had approved allocations since the state files did not necessarily reflect requested and approved budget revisions that transferred funds from one purpose to another.

Table 2

Number of Community College Districts that Had Approved Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations, Claimed Federal Funds, and Responded to the Survey

Year and Allocation Purpose	Had Approved Allocations	Claimed Federal Funds	Claimed Funds and Returned Questionnaire
1977-78 Subpart 3			
Disadvantaged Students	68	65	56
LEP Students	61	51	42
Handicapped Students	67	65	57
1977-78 Subpart 4			
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	29	29	24
Sum, 1977-78	225	210	179
1978-79 Subpart 3			
Voc. Guidance and Counseling	69	69	61
Voc. Ed. Personnel Training	32	28	25
Sex Bias and Stereotyping	30	27	21
Disadvantaged Students	67	65	55
LEP Students	7	7	5
Handicapped Students	65	63	55
1978-79 Subpart 4			
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	25	25	21
Sum, 1978-79	295	284	243

The approved federal budgets and federal funds claimed are shown in Table 3. The total funds allocated in 1977-78 were approximately $2.2 million for secondary schools and $2.1 million for community colleges. The total funds allocated for 1978-79 were approximately $2.8 million for secondary schools and $3.2 million for community colleges.

For 1977-78 allocations, secondary school districts claimed about $1.8 million, or 84% of the approved funds. Community college districts claimed $1.7 million which was 82% of the approved funds. For 1978-79 allocations,

Table 3

Approved Federal Budgets and Funds Claimed for Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations

Year and Allocation Purpose	Secondary Schools: Approved Federal Budget	Secondary Schools: Funds Claimed	Community Colleges: Approved Federal Budget	Community Colleges: Funds Claimed
1977-78 Subpart 3				
Disadvantaged Students	$ 864,368	$ 731,109	$ 777,137	$ 607,500
LEP Students	48,164	36,259	41,741	34,659
Handicapped Students	442,234	376,266	431,847	357,922
Total Subpart 3	1,354,766	1,143,632	1,250,725	1,000,081
1977-78 Subpart 4				
Programs/Services	828,886	691,881	825,231	700,764
Sum, 1977-78	2,183,652	1,835,513	2,075,956	1,700,845
1978-79 Subpart 3				
Local Administration	$ 24,409	$ 25,984	$ 0	$ 0
Voc. Guidance and Counseling	542,346	457,698	855,648	796,844
Voc. Ed. Personnel Training	651,289	485,259	266,166	229,335
Sex Bias and Stereotyping	10,936	16,252	152,460	107,188
Disadvantaged Students	436,501	230,416	508,896	469,654
LEP Students	15,404	15,112	17,433	11,685
Handicapped Students	307,049	180,829	353,377	320,430
Total Subpart 3	1,987,954	1,411,550	2,154,000	1,935,116
1978-79 Subpart 4				
Programs/Services	785,818	699,241	1,102,680	996,022
Sum, 1978-79	2,773,772	2,110,771	3,256,680	2,931,138

secondary schools claimed $2.1 million (76%), while community college districts claimed $2.9 million (91%).

Activities Supported by the Allocations

Activities reported on the returned questionnaires were classified according to the activity categories described in the Method section. The results are presented below by subpart and legislative purpose. Also included are the results

of a comparison of proposed and completed activities for the secondary school and community college districts that were site visited.

Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students allocations. Secondary school activities are shown in Table B-1 in Appendix B for those districts that claimed Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students funds and returned a questionnaire. The most frequently carried out secondary school activities in 1977-78 were: providing student counseling and guidance services (reported by 31% of the districts), obtaining or developing student instructional materials (25%), providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (20%), and providing aides and tutors for student instruction (19%). In 1978-79, the most frequently carried out activities were: providing student counseling and guidance services (18%), providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (18%), and obtaining or developing counseling and guidance materials (15%). Generally, the activities supported by the allocations in 1977-78 were similar to those supported in 1978-79. Thirty-two districts (15%) which claimed 1977-78 funds and one district (1%) which claimed 1978-79 funds did not report any activity.

Community college activities supported by Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students funds are shown in Table B-2 in Appendix B. The most frequently carried out activity in both 1977-78 and 1978-79 was providing students counseling and guidance services (62%). Other frequently carried out 1977-78 activities were providing aides or tutors for student instruction (18%), and providing instructional services to students (11%). For 1978-79, other frequently carried out activities were: obtaining or developing student counseling and guidance materials (15%), providing clerical help (15%), and providing instructional services to students (15%). The activities for 1977-78 and 1978-79 were similar. For each year three districts did not report any activity, even though they had claimed funds.

Subpart 3 LES Students allocations. The number of LES Students allocations for secondary school districts was relatively small, compared with the number for Disadvantaged Students or Handicapped Students. In 1977-78 there were only 42 secondary school districts and in 1978-79 only 12 districts that claimed LES Students funds and returned a questionnaire. Their activities are shown in Table B-3 in Appendix B.

The most frequently carried out secondary school activities in 1977-78 were: obtaining or developing instructional materials for students (29%),

obtaining or developing counseling and guidance materials (19%), and providing aides or tutors for student instruction (17%). For 1978-79, the most frequently carried out activities were obtaining or developing counseling and guidance materials (40%), and providing student counseling and guidance services (33%). Five districts (10%) which claimed 1977-78 funds did not report any activity.

The number of community college districts that claimed LES Students funds and returned a questionnaire was also small: 42 in 1977-78 and five in 1978-79. Community college activities supported with LES Students allocations are shown in Table B-6. The most frequently carried out activities in 1977-78 were providing student counseling and guidance services (29%), and providing instructional services to students (21%). Two districts (5%) did not report any activity in 1977-78. For 1978-79, two of the five districts used the funds to provide student counseling and guidance services, two provided aides or tutors for student instruction, and one district did not report any activity.

Subpart 3 Handicapped Students allocations. Secondary school activities are shown in Table B-5 for those districts that claimed Subpart 3 Handicapped Students funds and returned a questionnaire. The most frequently carried out activity in both 1977-78 and 1978-79 was providing student counseling and guidance services (37% and 36% respectively). Other frequently carried out activities in 1977-78 were: providing aides or tutors for student instruction (18%), obtaining or developing instructional materials (16%), and providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (15%). For 1978-79, other frequently reported activities were providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (32%), and obtaining or developing student counseling and guidance materials (20%). The activities supported by the allocations in 1977-78 and 1978-79 were similar. Thirty-seven districts (17%) that claimed 1977-78 funds and five districts (5%) that claimed 1978-79 funds did not report any activity.

Community college activities supported by Subpart 3 Handicapped Students allocations are shown in Table B-6. The most frequently carried out activity in both 1977-78 and 1978-79 was providing student counseling and guidance services (75% and 69%, respectively. Another frequently reported activity in 1977-78 was providing aides, tutors, or readers for student instruction (18%). For 1978-79, other frequently reported activities were providing workshops and conferences for personnel training (27%), and providing aides, tutors, or readers for student instruction (16%). Generally, the activities for 1977-78 and 1978-79 were similar.

Subpart 3 Local Administration allocations. Allocations for Local Administration were made only for secondary school districts in 1978-79. Initially, 10 allocations were made but later nine more were approved. Claims were made by 18 districts, and their reported uses of the funds are shown in Table B-7. The funds were most often used to provide administrative services (50%) and to pay for indirect costs (28%).

Subpart 3 Vocational Guidance and Counseling allocations. These allocations were made starting in 1978-79. Table B-8 presents both secondary school and community college activities supported by these funds. The most frequently reported activities by secondary school districts were: providing student counseling and guidance services (45%), obtaining or developing counseling and guidance materials (42%), and providing workshops and conferences for personnel training (25%). The same three activities were also reported as most frequently carried out by community college districts (84%, 31%, and 26%, respectively).

Subpart 3 Vocational Education Personnel Training allocations. Personnel training allocations were also made starting in 1978-79. Activities supported by these funds are shown in Table B-9 for both secondary school and community college districts. The activities reported most frequently by secondary school districts were: providing workshops or conferences for personnel training or development (91%), providing for tours or visits (11%), and obtaining personnel training materials (11%). The most frequently reported community college activities were: providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (96%), obtaining personnel training materials (16%), and obtaining or developing materials for student instruction (16%). Eleven school districts (7%) and two community college districts (8%) did not report any activities.

Subpart 3 Grants to Overcome Sex Bias and Stereotyping. Grants to Overcome Sex Bias and Stereotyping were made in 1978-79, but not in 1977-78. Activities supported by these funds are shown in Table B-10 for both secondary school and community college districts. A relatively small number of the grants were made for secondary school districts. The typical activity reported by secondary school districts was providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (8%). The most frequently reported community college activities were: providing workshops or conferences for personnel training (57%), obtaining or revising student counseling and guidance materials (48%), and conducting a survey or examining materials for sex fairness (19%).

Subpart 4 Special Programs for the Disadvantaged allocations. There were

80 secondary school districts in 1977-78 and 62 districts in 1978-79 that claimed Subpart 4 disadvantaged funds and returned a questionnaire. Their reported activities are shown in Table B-11. The most frequently carried out secondary school activity in both 1977-78 and 1978-79 was providing aides or tutors for student instruction (49% and 52%, respectively). Other frequently carried out activities in 1977-78 were providing instructional services to students (24%), and obtaining or developing instructional materials (24%). For 1978-79, other frequently carried out activities were: obtaining or developing instructional materials (29%), providing counseling and guidance services (19%), and providing instructional services (18%). The activities supported by the funds in 1977-78 and in 1978-79 were very similar. Seven districts (9%) which claimed 1977-78 funds and two districts (3%) which claimed 1978-79 funds did not report any activity.

Community college activities funded by Subpart 4 are shown in Table B-12. The most frequently reported activity in both 1977-78 and 1978-79 was providing instructional services to students (50% and 81%, respectively). Other frequently reported 1977-78 activities were: providing aides and tutors for student instruction (46%), providing counseling and guidance services (33%), and obtaining or developing instructional materials (25%). For 1978-79, other frequently reported activities were obtaining instructional materials (52%) and providing aides and tutors for student instruction (43%). The reported activities for the two years were very similar.

Comparison of proposed and completed activities for districts that were visited. For the 10 secondary school and 10 community college districts that were site visited, the activities proposed or inferred from the applications for funds were compared with the activities reported on the questionnaires to determine their similarity. A judgment was made as to whether the proposed and completed activities for each allocation were similar, borderline, or dissimilar. Since there were no separate Subpart 3 applications for funds for 1977-78, as previously noted, these comparisons were made only for 1978-79 Subpart 3 allocations and for both 1977-78 and 1978-79 Subpart 4 allocations.

The results are shown in Table 4. Considering the secondary school districts that were site visited, for 65% of the Subpart 3 and 4 allocations the proposed activities were similar to the activities reported on the questionnaires as having been completed. Proposed and completed activities were more similar for Subpart 4

Table 4

Similarity of Activities Proposed and Reported as Completed by Districts That Were Visited

Type of District and Subpart	Number of Allocations	Similarity of Proposed and Completed Activities		
		Percent Similar	Percent Borderline	Percent Dissimilar
Secondary School Districts				
Subpart 3: Program Improvement	37	62	14	24
Subpart 4: Special Disadvantaged	18	72	22	6
Subparts 3 and 4	55	65	16	18
Community College Districts				
Subpart 3: Program Improvement	38	29	39	32
Subpart 4: Special Disadvantaged	9	44	33	22
Subparts 3 and 4	47	32	38	30

Note. Data are shown only for the 10 secondary school and 10 community college districts that were site visited. Data for 1977-78 Subpart 3 are not included since there were no applications for that year.

allocations (72%) than for Subpart 3 allocations (62%). For almost a quarter of the Subpart 3 allocations the proposed and completed activities were dissimilar.

Activities proposed in applications for funds and reported on the questionnaires as completed were less similar for community college allocations than for the secondary schools. The proposed activities were similar to the activities completed for only about a third (32%) of the Subpart 3 and 4 allocations. As with the secondary schools, proposed and completed activities were more similar for Subpart 4 allocations (44%) than for Subpart 3 allocations (29%). About a third (32%) of the community college activities proposed for Subpart 3 allocations were found to be dissimilar to the activities reported as having been completed.

Activities Which Would Not Have Been Possible

One of the study objectives was to identify activities which would not have been possible if the allocated funds were not available. Each recipient of an allocation was asked to report activities which would not have been carried out without the funds. Table 5 shows the number and percentage of such activities

Table 8

Secondary School Activities Which Secondarie Said Would Not Have Been Possible Without the Allocations

Activity	Number of Activities: Total Carried Out	Would Not Have Been Possible	Percent
Implemented, improved, or provided student counseling and guidance services	309	287	93
Obtained, modified, or developed student counseling and guidance:			
Materials	143	130	91
Equipment	66	63	95
Offered or provided instructional services to students	93	89	96
Provided personnel for student instruction:			
Teachers	16	16	100
Aides or tutors	170	160	94
Obtained, modified, or developed materials or equipment for student instruction:			
Materials	142	130	91
Equipment	67	67	100
Provided personnel training or development:			
Workshops or conferences	343	314	92
Tours or visits	38	38	100
Obtained, modified, or developed personnel training materials	68	68	100
Provided clerical help	66	66	100
Sum	1,490	1,350	91

Note. Activities representing less than 1% of the total number of activities carried out are not included.

reported by secondary school districts. Information shown in the table is based on all allocations made in the two years for the different legislative purposes.

The most frequently reported secondary school activities which would not have been possible without the allocations were providing workshops or conferences

for personnel training, and providing student counselling and guidance services. Other frequently reported activities which would not have been possible were: providing aides or tutors for student instruction, obtaining or developing counselling and guidance materials, and obtaining or developing materials for student instruction. In the judgment of secondary school respondents, approximately 33% of all activities carried out with the allocations would not have been possible without the funds. In other words, respondents said that only 7% of all the activities which were carried out in 1977-78 and 1978-79 would have been possible if the allocations were not available.

Similar data for community colleges are shown in Table 6. The most frequently reported activity which would not have been possible without the allocations was providing student counselling and guidance services. Another frequently carried out activity which would not have been possible was to provide workshops and conferences for personnel training. Community college respondents reported that approximately 78% of all activities carried out with the allocations would not have been possible without the allocations. That is, respondents said that 22% of all the activities which were carried out in 1977-78 and 1978-79 would have been possible if the allocations were not available.

Short-term and lasting effects of the allocations

The short-term and lasting effects of the allocations that were reported by recipients of the funds were classified according to type. The results are summarized in Tables 7 to 10 below by subpart and year. A short-term effect was defined as an effect directly attributable to an allocation during the funding period, a lasting effect as an effect directly attributable to an allocation which lasted beyond the funding period.

Short-term effects of the allocations. Table 7 presents the types of short-term effects reported by secondary school recipients. The percentages of the recipients reporting each type of effect are shown for subpart 3 and 4 separately by year. Since some recipients reported more than one effect, the sum of the percentages for a given subpart usually exceeds 100%.

For subpart 3 allocations, the most frequently reported secondary school effect in 1977-78 was that students received additional counseling and guidance services (18%), while in 1978-79 it was that staff became more aware, knowledgeable, or effective (29%). This difference may be explained by the fact that a large number of personnel training allocations were made in 1978-79. Other

Table 6

Community College Activities Which Respondents Said Would Not Have Been Possible Without the Allocations

Activity	Number of Activities That Were Carried Out	Number of Activities That Would Not Have Been Possible	Percent
Recruited students or promoted program or services	13	13	100
Implemented, improved, or provided student counseling and guidance services	179	117	65
Obtained, modified, or developed student counseling and guidance materials	91	85	93
Provided student placement services	10	10	100
Offered or provided instructional services to students	97	96	99
Provided aides or tutors for student instruction	84	67	79
Obtained, modified, or developed materials or equipment for student instruction:			
Materials	68	60	85
Equipment	13	11	85
Provided workshops or conferences for personnel training or development	85	78	92
Conducted a survey or evaluation (including examining materials for sex fairness)	11	11	100
Provided clerical help	77	33	77
Sum	554	434	78

Note. Activities representing less than 1% of the total number of activities carried out are not included.

Frequently reported effects were: materials, supplies, or equipment became available (138 in 1977-78 and 158 in 1978-79); and students received additional instructional support services (148 in 1977-78). A relatively large number of 1977-78 recipients of Subpart 3 allocations did not report any effect because either they did not know what activities had been carried out (163), or there were no known effects (68).

Table 7

Short-term Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Secondary School Districts

Short-term Effect	Percent Reporting the Effect*			
	Subpart 3		Subpart 4	
	1977-78 (N=469)	1978-79 (N=568)	1977-78 (N=80)	1978-79 (N=62)
Materials, supplies, or equipment became available	13	15	0	0
Students received additional counseling and guidance services	18	13	11	10
Students received additional instructional support or services	14	5	32	48
Students improved basic skills or grades	9	3	22	24
Students improved skills in career choice/ job-seeking	5	10	4	3
Students improved attitudes, motivation, or attendance	6	3	15	15
More students were successful in class or completed class	7	4	20	23
More students were enrolled in vocational classes	3	2	1	0
Program, curriculum, or services were improved	7	13	10	3
Staff became more aware, knowledgeable, or effective	10	29	4	0
Other effects reported infrequently	12	16	6	3
No effects or effects unknown	6	6	1	3
Not applicable, because no activities were reported	16	4	9	3

*The percents are based on the total number of Subpart 3 or Subpart 4 allocations for which claims were made and questionnaires returned. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple effects for an allocation.

For secondary school Subpart 4 allocations, the short-term effects reported in 1977-78 and 1978-79 were very similar. Most frequently reported effects were: students received additional instructional support or services (32% in 1977-78 and 48% in 1978-79); students improved basic skills or grades (22% and 24%); and more students were successful in class or completed class (20% and 23%).

Table 8 presents the types of short-term effects reported by community college recipients. For Subpart 3 allocations, the most frequently reported effect for both years was that students received additional counseling and

Table 8

Short-term Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Community College Districts

Short-term Effect	Percent Reporting the Effect[a]			
	Subpart 3		Subpart 4	
	1977-78 (N=155)	1978-79 (N=222)	1977-78 (N=24)	1978-79 (N=21)
Materials, supplies, or equipment became available	9	12	8	19
Students received additional counseling and guidance services	35	28	17	5
Students received additional instructional support or services	18	5	25	43
Students improved basic skills or grades	4	4	8	14
Students improved skills in career choice/ job-seeking	6	7	0	0
Students improved attitudes, motivation, or attendance	5	4	12	14
More students were successful in class or completed class	15	9	29	29
More students were enrolled in vocational classes	4	6	0	0
Program, curriculum, or services were improved	10	20	12	19
Staff became more aware, knowledgeable, or effective	5	16	0	0
The career center was improved or expanded	0	3	0	0
Students were placed in jobs	0	0	8	10
Other effects reported infrequently	14	16	4	19
No effects or effects unknown	8	7	4	5
Not applicable, because no activities were reported	5	3	0	0

[a]The percents are based on the total number of Subpart 3 or Subpart 4 allocations for which claims were made and questionnaires were returned. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple effects for an allocation.

guidance services (35% in 1977-78 and 28% in 1978-79). Other frequently reported effects for 1977-78 included that students received additional instructional support or services (18%), and more students successfully completed class (15%). For 1978-79, improved curriculum or services (20%) and better informed staff (16%) were frequently reported short-term effects.

Considering community college Subpart 4 allocations, the most frequently reported short-term effects for both years were that students received additional instructional support or services (25% and 43%, respectively), and more students successfully completed class (29% for both years).

Lasting effects of the allocations. The types of lasting effects and percentages of secondary school recipients reporting each are shown in Table 9. For Subpart 3 allocations, the most frequently reported lasting effects for 1977-78 were the availability of materials or equipment in later years (17%), and the continuation of similar services or activities in the following years (12%). The most frequent lasting effects of the 1978-79 allocations were more informed or skilled staff (18%), and the availability of materials and equipment in later years (16%). Approximately 33% of the 1977-78 recipients did not report any lasting effect because either they did not know what activities had been carried out, or there were no known effects.

For Subpart 4 secondary school allocations, the lasting effects reported for the two years were very similar. The most frequently reported effect for both years was the continuation of similar services or activities in the following years (19% and 26%, respectively). Other frequently reported lasting effects were improved basic skills (15% and 11%), and the availability of materials or equipment in later years (12% and 11%).

Similar data on the lasting effects reported by community college recipients are shown in Table 10. For Subpart 3 allocations, the most frequently reported effect for both years was the continuation of similar services or activities in the following years (17% and 19%, respectively). Other frequently reported Subpart 3 effects included: more informed or skilled staff (8% and 15%); the availability of materials or equipment in later years (8% and 13%); and improved curriculum or services (10% and 9%).

For community colleges Subpart 4 allocations, the lasting effects reported for 1977-78 and 1978-79 were quite similar. The most frequently reported effect for both years was the continuation of similar services or activities in the

Table 9

Lasting Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Secondary School Districts

Lasting Effect	Percent Reporting the Effect[a]			
	Subpart 3		Subpart 4	
	1977-78 (N=469)	1978-79 (N=540)	1977-78 (N=80)	1978-79 (N=62)
Materials, supplies, or equipment are still used or available	17	16	12	11
Similar services or activities continued in following years	12	9	19	26
Students improved attitudes, motivation, or attendance	3	1	2	0
Students improved basic skills	0	0	15	11
Students took advanced courses or went into advanced studies	2	2	9	6
Students were placed in jobs	3	3	0	0
Program, curriculum, or services were improved	8	11	7	0
Staff became more aware, skilled, or informed	6	18	6	3
Other effects reported infrequently	16	17	11	18
No effects or effects unknown	17	21	14	19
Not applicable, because no activities were reported	16	5	9	3

[a]The percents are based on the total number of Subpart 3 or Subpart 4 allocations for which claims were made and questionnaires returned. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple effects for an allocation.

following years (46% and 52, respectively). Other frequently reported effects included the availability of materials or equipment (12% and 29%), and improved curriculum or services (12% and 19%).

Beneficiaries of the Allocations

Each LEA that received an allocation reported the number and certain characteristics of beneficiaries. There were two types of people who benefited: vocational education students and LEA personnel.

Students who benefited. Vocational education student beneficiaries were

Table 10

Lasting Effects Attributed to Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations for Community College Districts

Lasting Effect	Percent Reporting the Effect[a]			
	Subpart 3		Subpart 4	
	1977-78 (N=155)	1978-79 (N=222)	1977-78 (N=24)	1978-79 (N=21)
Materials, supplies, or equipment are still used or available	8	13	12	29
Similar services or activities continued in following years	17	19	46	52
Students stayed in school or completed courses	8	6	12	10
Students were placed in jobs	7	3	8	20
Program, curriculum, or services were improved	10	9	12	19
Staff became more aware, skilled, or informed	8	15	0	5
Other effects reported infrequently	16	23	12	14
No effects or effects unknown	21	14	12	14
Not applicable, because no activities were reported	5	3	0	0

[a]The percents are based on the total number of Subpart 3 or Subpart 4 allocations for which claims were made and questionnaires returned. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple effects for an allocation.

reported for approximately 76% of the secondary school allocations and 78% of the community college allocations. The average number of beneficiaries was 315 students for secondary school and 443 students for community college allocations. The numbers of vocational education students who benefited from the allocations are shown in Table 11 for secondary schools and Table 12 for the community colleges. A total of 281,469 secondary school students and 145,569 community college students were reported to have benefited from the allocations in 1977-78 and 1978-79.

Since information on the student beneficiaries was available by ethnic classification and sex for only about half of the allocations, the numbers of student beneficiaries are shown in Tables 11 and 12 only by special need group

Table 11

Number of Secondary School Vocational Education Students Reported as Benefiting from the Allocations

Year and Allocation Purpose	Number Reported as Benefiting: Disadvantaged Students	LES Students	Handicapped Students	Other[a] Students	Total Students
1977-78 Subpart 3					
Disadvantaged Students	27,976	470	106	1,687	30,239
LES Students	72	1,101	11	0	1,184
Handicapped Students	83	30	7,588	154	7,855
1977-78 Subpart 4					
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	12,065	351	87	175	12,678
Sum, 1977-78	40,196	1,952	7,792	2,016	51,956
1978-79 Subpart 3					
Local Administration	1,264	67	152	3,616	5,099
Voc. Guidance and Counseling	25,348	2,506	2,217	75,253	105,324
Voc. Ed. Personnel Training	16,669	3,208	1,489	43,268	64,634
Sex Bias and Stereotyping	2,592	1,714	87	2,779	7,172
Disadvantaged Students	24,628	2,166	771	210	27,775
LES Students	0	811	0	0	811
Handicapped Students	491	0	5,033	30	5,554
1978-79 Subpart 4					
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	12,338	409	81	266	13,094
Sum, 1978-79	83,330	10,881	9,830	125,422	229,463

[a]"Other Students" includes adults, unspecified, and non-special needs vocational education students.

(Disadvantaged, LES, and Handicapped) and others. The "Other Students" columns include adult, unspecified, and non-special needs beneficiaries. The patterns of student beneficiaries for the secondary schools and for the community colleges are strikingly similar. For instance, a large majority of beneficiaries in 1977-78 were disadvantaged students, while the "Other Students" group had the

Table 12

Number of Community College Vocational Education Students Reported as Benefiting from the Allocations

Year and Allocation Purpose	Number Reported as Benefiting: Disadvantaged Students	LES Students	Handicapped Students	Other[a] Students	Total Students
1977-78 Subpart 3					
Disadvantaged Students	12,850	35	29	957	13,871
LES Students	75	2,220	0	0	2,295
Handicapped Students	0	0	4,638	0	4,638
1977-78 Subpart 4					
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	5,537	260	113	1,035	6,945
Sum, 1977-78	18,462	2,515	4,780	1,992	27,749
1978-79 Subpart 3					
Voc. Guidance and Counseling	14,528	1,514	2,310	46,084	64,436
Voc. Ed. Personnel Training	0	0	37	15,242	15,279
Sex Bias and Stereotyping	0	3	3	2,645	2,651
Disadvantaged Students	19,213	657	62	50	19,982
LES Students	0	161	0	0	161
Handicapped Students	123	0	6,184	270	6,577
1978-79 Subpart 4					
Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students	8,382	119	32	101	8,634
Sum, 1978-79	42,246	2,454	8,628	64,392	117,720

[a]"Other Students" includes adults, unspecified, and non-special needs vocational education students.

largest number of beneficiaries in 1978-79. Also, as the data in the tables show, for both secondary schools and community colleges there were about four times more beneficiaries in 1978-79 compared with 1977-78.

The much larger number of second-year beneficiaries was the results of a relatively large number of students who benefited from two specific legislative purpose allocations: Vocational Guidance and Counseling, and Vocational

Education Personnel Training. An examination of the questionnaire responses revealed that for several of these allocations all or most of the vocational education enrollments were reported as beneficiaries. The reason given was that all students benefited from better instruction or counseling services due to personnel training. It may also be noted in the tables that the students who were reported as benefiting were not always restricted to those who were the primary target for a legislative purpose allocation. For example, students classified as other than disadvantaged were reported as benefiting from Disadvantaged Students allocations.

Vocational education personnel who benefited. For about 73% of both secondary school and community college allocations, it was reported that one or more types of personnel benefited from the allocation expenditures. Table 13 presents the number of district, school, and college personnel reported as benefiting. A total of 12,373 secondary school personnel, averaging 14 per allocation, were reported as having benefited over the two years. A total of 7,786 community college personnel benefited over the two years, averaging 25 per allocation.

Table 13

Number of District, School, and College Personnel Reported as Benefiting from the Subpart 3 and 4 Allocations

Type of Personnel	Secondary Schools		Community Colleges	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
Administrative staff	227	816	70	1,006
Instructional staff	1,599	6,866	354	4,489
Counseling and guidance staff	499	1,713	212	1,351
Aides	191	102	52	37
Tutors	15	25	26	32
Special education staff	10	231	2	30
Other personnel reported less frequently	25	54	29	96
Sum	2,566	9,807	745	7,041

As expected, instructional staff was the largest group of beneficiaries. For secondary schools, about 62% of the 1977-78 beneficiaries were instructional staff, while for 1978-79 70% were instructional staff. For community colleges, instructional staff were 48% of the 1977-78 beneficiaries and 64% of the

1978-79 beneficiaries. Other large groups of beneficiaries were counseling and guidance staff, and administrative staff. There were many more district, school, and college personnel who benefited from the 1978-79 allocations than from the 1977-78 allocations, because in that year a large number of personnel training and guidance and counseling allocations were made.

Credibility of Information Provided

The purpose of the site visits made to 10 secondary school and 10 community college districts was to verify outcomes of allocation expenditures. This included validating that the activities reported on the questionnaires were actually carried out, and that reported products were actually generated. The visits were to verify questionnaire data in order to determine how much confidence could be placed in what was reported, and to better understand what was reported.

At the conclusion of each site visit, all available information about an allocation's outcomes was jointly evaluated by an EERI representative and a community college or secondary school consultant who was an expert with experience in that setting. A rating was then made of the confidence that could be placed in each of five questionnaire responses. Factors related to the appropriateness of responses or sources of information were also rated. The rating scale used was: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Borderline (but acceptable), 2 = Poor (below expectations), and 1 = Very Poor. Mean credibility ratings were then obtained for secondary schools and community colleges. Subpart 3 and 4 allocations were pooled since the number of each was relatively small and credibility did not appear to be a function of legislative purpose. Also, the results for 1977-78 and 1978-79 were pooled since they were highly similar. The results are shown in Table 14.

Activities carried out. The first factor rated using the scale noted above was the appropriateness of the activities for an allocation in terms of the legislative purpose. A rating of "5" (excellent) was assigned if all of the activities were completely appropriate in terms of the legislative purpose. A rating of "1" (very poor) was assigned if the activities appeared to be completely inappropriate. The mean rating for secondary schools was 4.0 (good appropriateness). The mean for the community colleges was slightly lower, 3.5.

The ratings of confidence that could be placed in the questionnaire responses themselves were made with all things considered. A rating of "5"

Table 14

Credibility Ratings Assigned to Questionnaire Responses for Sites That Were Visited

Questionnaire Item and Factors Rated	Mean Rating: Secondary Schools (N=71)	Mean Rating: Community Colleges (N=72)
Activities carried out		
Appropriateness in terms of legislative purpose	4.0	3.5
Confidence in the questionnaire response	3.3	2.7
Short-term effects directly attributable		
Appropriateness of stated effects	3.6	3.5
Confidence in the questionnaire response	3.3	2.8
Lasting effects directly attributable		
Appropriateness of stated effects	3.6	3.3
Confidence in the questionnaire response	3.1	2.6
Number of students who received benefit		
Appropriateness of source of information	3.2	3.0
Confidence in the questionnaire response	3.2	2.1
Number of LEA personnel who received benefit		
Appropriateness of source of information	3.9	3.7
Confidence in the questionnaire response	3.6	2.5

Note. The rating scale used for both appropriateness and confidence was: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Borderline (but acceptable), 2 = Poor (below expectations), and 1 = Very poor. "N" indicates the number of questionnaires (allocations) upon which the mean ratings were based. Some of the mean ratings are based upon fewer allocations than shown since some questionnaire items were not applicable for a given allocation.

(excellent) was assigned if there was absolutely no reason at all to question what was reported on the questionnaire. A "1" (very poor) was assigned if absolutely no confidence could be placed in what was reported on the questionnaire based upon what was learned during the site visit. For secondary schools the mean confidence rating was 3.3 (borderline but acceptable confidence) for the questionnaire item that asked for a list of each activity that was actually carried out and partially or fully funded by the allocation. The mean rating for the community colleges was 2.7 (borderline but acceptable confidence).

Short-term effects. The appropriateness of the effects reported as directly attributable to the allocation during the funding period was another factor rated. A "5" (excellent) was assigned if all of the effects reported (observable or not) seemed to be appropriate and directly attributable to the allocation, whether or not there was evidence. A rating of "1" (very poor) was assigned if all the claimed effects appeared to be inappropriately attributed to the allocation. Secondary schools had a mean rating of 3.6 (good appropriateness) on this factor, while community colleges had a mean of 3.5. The mean rating of the confidence that could be placed in what was reported on the questionnaire for short-term effects was 3.3 (borderline but acceptable confidence) for the secondary schools and 2.8 (borderline but acceptable confidence) for the community colleges.

Lasting effects. The appropriateness of the effects reported as directly attributable to the allocation which lasted beyond the funding period was rated following the same guidelines noted above for short-term effects. The mean for secondary schools was 3.6 (good appropriateness), the mean for community colleges 3.3 (borderline appropriateness). For the secondary schools the mean rating of the confidence that could be placed in what was reported on the questionnaire was 3.1 (borderline but acceptable confidence). For the community colleges it was 2.6 (borderline but acceptable confidence). Somewhat greater confidence was placed in what was reported for short-term gains than in what was reported for lasting effects.

Number of students who received benefit. The appropriateness of the source of information as to the estimated number of students who received benefit from an allocation was also rated. A rating of "5" (excellent) was assigned if the source was completely appropriate, such as a list maintained of individual students served by a program. A "1" (very poor) was assigned if the source of

[illegible] appeared completely inappropriate. The mean appropriateness rating was borderline but acceptable for both secondary schools and community colleges (5.3 and 5.0, respectively.) The mean rating for the confidence that could be placed in the questionnaire item about the number of students who received benefit was 5.5 (borderline but acceptable confidence) for the secondary school districts. However, the confidence in community college responses was considerably lower, 3.1 (poor confidence). This was the lowest mean obtained from the rating process.

Number of personnel who received benefit. The item questionnaire item for which ratings were obtained asked for the estimated number of districts, schools, or college personnel who received benefit from the allocation. The appropriateness of the source of information was rated using guidelines similar to those shown above for the number of students who benefited. The mean appropriateness rating was 5.9 (good appropriateness) for secondary schools and 5.7 (also good appropriateness) for community colleges. The mean rating of confidence that could be placed in secondary schools responses to the questionnaire item was 5.6 (good confidence). For the community colleges it was 5.3 (borderline but acceptable confidence). These values are all higher than the corresponding means for the item about student beneficiaries.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section addresses five major topics: effectiveness assessment criteria that were applied, effectiveness outcomes and impact, the effective process and accountability, and the improvement of future evaluations. Some of the issues considered in a given section may pertain to other topics as well.

To facilitate an understanding of some of the discussion in Section, it may be useful to describe a hypothetical effectiveness, such as the following:

Goal

To improve counseling and guidance services for disadvantaged vocational education students.

Objective (Purpose)

To improve the knowledge and skills of counseling and guidance staff so that they may better serve disadvantaged vocational education students.

Activities

1. An inservice, two-week workshop was provided for the counselors.
2. The counselors and two administrators visited three schools with large concentrations of disadvantaged students and talked with counselors at those schools.

Experiences Description and Descriptive/Associations

Counselors' opinions: Counselors' opinions during training.
Tutorial opinions: Tutorial support for workshops and visits.
Other books: References materials for workshops.
Media supplies: Audiovisual materials for workshops.
Consultants (Services): Consultants for workshop presentations.
Conferences, travel: Travel to visit other schools.

Short-term Effect

Counseling and guidance staff improved their knowledge and skills.

Lasting Effect

Counseling and guidance staff more effectively served disadvantaged students.

Number of Students Who Received Benefit

8,193

Number of Personnel Who Received Benefit

Administrative staff: 8
Instructional staff: 15

Assessing and Collecting Taxes 9
Municipal Credit 5

In the hypothetical situation, the following may be noted. First, the need to invest and commit be examined to be met over a one-year horizon or acceptable by an allocation for one legislative purpose or by one source of funds. Second, the objective is more acceptable for a given allocation, but knowledge of the most critical the objective could give a misleading picture of how the funds were spent. Third, the activities give specific information as to the extent carried out to achieve the purpose of the allocation. Fourth, although the expenditure classifications and descriptions/specifications varied significantly how the funds were spent, it can only be used cautiously to infer the activities and, as in one, may be misleading. Fifth, although the short-term effect provides information relevant to the objective for the allocation, it does not necessarily give insight into the activities carried out. And sixth, the learning effect given even less insight into the activities carried out, even though it received the most.

Allocation Specifications

The total approved federal budgets for Subparts 1 and 2 allocations in 1977-78 and in 1978-79 were approximately $6.38 million for secondary schools and $5.31 million for the community colleges. Of the total of $10.35 million, $8 was approved for secondary schools while $8 was approved for community colleges. Considering Subpart 2, the total approved federal budget was $3.04 million: $1.61 million (46%) for secondary schools and $1.33 million (54%) for community colleges. Since the approved federal budget does not include allocated funds released by individual secondary schools and community colleges, these figures do not represent the total of the funds actually allocated. Since The California Private Home Study Act for Vocational Education, provided for allocating 8% of Subpart 2 funds each year to secondary and 8% to postsecondary, it could appear that more Subpart 2 secondary than community college funds were released. Reasons why funds were actually released were not ascertained in this study.

The data available indicate that 6% of the total amount of the approved federal budgets for 1977-78 and 1978-79 for secondary schools was actually claimed, while for community colleges 8% was claimed. Similarly, for 18 of the secondary school allocations and 16 of the community college allocations, no claims were made or less than 5% of the approved budget amounts were claimed.

8.2

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

- [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

- [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

In spite of the problems that were noted above regarding the use of reported gross filtration values, it is important that the filtration test takes on additional importance. Because of the low cost that the filtration procedure could save for owners buying personal watercraft, some for personal training that could not have been anticipated. In light of the problems, is there an individual filtration test that could be used? However, through the filtration calculations it is also apparent that there are concerns there, although the specific causes of the issues is probably complex.

The Filtration Process and Functionality

The filtration process: It is difficult to assess the success of the current filtration system of discriminating between a good & bad fuel. Although the filtration test itself, in terms of the used fuels used it is not clear whether or not the overall issues could have been greater had the fuels been used for additional control process determining specific properties. In addition, there are fewer requirements for the acceptability of filtered fuels, which often cannot to be used for routine operation.

- It is recommended that the flowrates of fuels for the experiments differ across the range the current of the filtration system and the rates of flow is the range of what the filtration system was designed to operate. It is also recommended that different fuels be used for additional control process.

Generally, one of the issues of which could cause inaccurate to maintain the speed of the fuels for the purpose for which they are intended. In terms the current filtration system, it is unknown for a specific different system of discriminating fuels. The alternate system could be in an effort to select applications for fuels for a specific application purpose. These applications could consist a statement of need, objectives, activities to be carried out, and the exact budget information. These applications could then be reviewed by committees at the state level and, criteria application purpose, and ordered in terms of requested need or other criteria and then be applying the most of use. The highest ranking proposals could then be funded in the order which are available for each application purpose. Each a system could also

provide funds to meet local needs, but accountability should be improved substantially.

- (1) It is recommended that the Secretary of Education and the Department's Office for Civil Rights undertake the study and pilot of administering a different system of distributing funds for the current allocation system in order to maximize the impact of the funds for the purposes for which they are intended.

To meet these, another source of action is to improve the allocation system, at least while consideration is being given to an alternate approach. One thing that could be done is to give more specific guidelines to LEAs as to how the funds can be spent and the types of activities that can be supported. Many suggestions can be found repeatedly during the site visits. Current guidelines give, at best, only the purposes for which the funds can be spent.

- (2) It is recommended that LEAs be given more specific guidelines about how the funds for each legislative purpose (category) allocation can be spent, and the types of activities that can be supported.

In a number of cases both at the administrative and during the site visits, LEA staff reported that allocated amounts were too small considering the costs of administration and accountability. It is reasonable to assume that, for any given local need, a minimal "critical mass" of funds is required for an allocation to accomplish a purpose or have impact.

- (3) It is recommended that minimal amounts to be allocated to an LEA be considered in terms of administrative and accountability costs, and that differing criteria be considered for each legislative purpose (category) as appropriate.

During the site visits positive views that were up and that had to do with combining allocations. Most split the Public allocations because too small and have low impact, while requiring more paperwork. Even with the current system some LEAs use all of their Subpart 2 allocations to support one or two major activities, such as providing student counseling and guidance services. (The hypothetical allocations given above, for example, could probably qualify for funding under services to disadvantaged students, counseling and guidance services, or personnel training.) Suggestions made by LEA personnel included combining Subpart 2 in one allocation, combining parts of Subparts 2 and 3, and combining Subparts 2 and 4. However, it is doubtful that such combining is possible under current federal regulations.

Accountability. Several steps can be taken to improve accountability

related to Subparts 2 and 3 allocations. First, instructions and applications for funds can be improved so that they specify more adequately what an LEA intends to do with allocated funds. Such documentation is useful not only for accountability and studies of impact, but also for LEA staff who will be responsible for carrying out proposed program improvements, supportive services, or special programs. In 1979-80 and 1979-81 application forms were not designed to adequately indicate what an LEA planned to do. The forms asked for need and expenditures descriptions/justifications, but not for objectives and activities. A review of the hypothetical allocation given above will indicate how difficult it is to ascertain exactly what the allocated funds will support if objectives and activities (or tasks) are not reported. In many cases, proposals of need contained a discussion of a general program that the allocation itself can be expected only a small portion of.

The secondary local combined application for 1980-81 ESA funds is an improvement over the form used in 1979-80, but it still has some of the limitations noted above. It requires that the specific use of allocated funds be described in detail, but it is not clear if "use" is objectives, tasks or activities, or expenditure descriptions. Budget explanations for Subparts 2 and 3 allocations do ask, for each specific object of expenditure classification, for a description of how the expenditure will "meet the needs of the students served with this program/service." But how the needs will be met is not necessarily adequate to indicate specifically what an LEA plans to do. Besides, for a given allocation (such as personnel training) there may be no students to be served with the program or service.

Similarly, the community colleges application for 1980-81 ESA funds is a considerable improvement over what was used in 1979-80. For both Subparts 2 and 3 it asks for a list of the needs and how the needs will be met, but "how the needs will be met" may mean different things to different people. Activities are to be described for Vocational Education Personnel Training and for Ingles as Desarrollo Bilingue and Biculturalism, but not for other Subpart 2 purposes or for Subpart 3. Budget explanations are to be given in terms of meeting needs and priorities. However, as previously noted, budget explanations do not necessarily indicate specifically what the LEA plans to do.

- It is recommended that Department of Education and Chancellor's Office applications for allocations and related instructions be further improved so that better descriptions of objectives and planned activities or tasks are given by LEAs.

A second step that can be taken to improve accountability is to tell CCDs ahead of time what accountability and evaluation information they will be asked to provide. In this way CCD staff will know what information to collect and maintain. For this study many CCDs were not able to provide more credible responses to the questionnaire items since there were no specific accountability or evaluation requirements. One possibility is to require that an accountability report be submitted with each fiscal claim for allocation funds, and provide a prototype of the report when the allocations are made. This report could ask for the same type of information obtained from the questionnaire for this study, plus reasons for any changes from what was proposed.

The community colleges currently submit an annual accountability report for Subparts 3 and 5 allocations. It asks, among other things, for population and program needs, and for a description as to how the needs were met. Asking how needs were met is comparable to asking about having effects. A review of the hypothetical allocation given above will reveal that information one does not relate to asking only about need and having effects.

These various issues lead to a series of related recommendations:

- Until the state is no longer required to evaluate in quantitative terms the effectiveness of each legislative purpose program, it is recommended that CCDs be notified that such an evaluation will be required and may involve a site visit.

- It is recommended that secondary school districts be asked to submit an accountability report with each fiscal claim for Subpart 3 or 5 funds, and that a prototype of the report be provided when the allocations are made. The accountability report should be designed to provide most, if not all, of the information needed for the evaluation of legislative purpose programs.

- It is recommended that the annual accountability report currently required of community college districts be further improved so that it can be a vehicle for providing most, if not all, of the information needed for the evaluation of legislative purpose programs.

- It is also recommended that, until information to evaluate the legislative purpose programs can be obtained from routinely submitted accountability reports, such programs continue to be evaluated using a questionnaire or a major data collection instrument with verification visits to selected sites.

Improvements of Future Evaluations

Previous sections of this report have provided recommendations and suggestions for the improvement of future evaluations of Subpart 3 and 5 allocations in the

direct cause. This section considers improvements in the evaluation process itself, and the related question of what specific information districts should be asked to report on their local impact of the allocations on vocational and occupational education can be determined.

The following suggestions are made for the improvement of the evaluation process:

1. The allocations for a given year should be evaluated as soon as possible after all or most final claims have been received. One reason that questionnaire responses were not as credible as they might have been was that considerable time had elapsed and, with normal staff turnover, the person responding was not particularly knowledgeable about what had occurred.

2. A number of respondents, particularly from the community colleges, recommended that more time be given to respond to the questionnaire. Some suggested as much as a few months. While this may be excessive, as much time as possible should be allowed within the time available. Although LEA staff were not prepared to respond to the questionnaires about 1977-78 and 1978-79 allocations, after having done so it may take them less time than previously to respond about allocations for subsequent years.

3. More adequate responses may be obtained if an example of a filled out questionnaire is provided for guidance.

4. Since there appears to be considerable overlap in the activities carried out for the various Subpart 3 allocations, consideration should be given to the feasibility of combining them for data collection and/or analysis and reporting purposes.

5. Consideration should be given to not including staff allocations in the evaluation. In terms of the costs involved in collecting and reporting information about such allocations and the smaller likelihood of their having had much impact, it may not be worth it to include them.

During the site visits LEA staff were asked their opinions as to what information districts should be asked to report on their local impact on vocational and occupational education can be determined. The same question was asked of the consultants that assisted with the site visits. The most frequent response was that the information requested on the questionnaire and during the site visits was reasonable. However, most districts did not have records of student beneficiaries by sex or racial/ethnic classification, reporting instead

data from enrollment reports.

- It is recommended that for future evaluations of the impact of Chapters 1 and 2 allocations, districts be asked to provide essentially the same type of information requested for 1977-78 and 1978-79. However, information on student beneficiaries broken down by sex and racial/ethnic classification should not be requested until after districts have been notified in advance that such information will need to be collected and reported.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR 1977-78 SUBPART 3 DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS ALLOCATIONS

Evaluation of Vocational Education Act Subpart 3 Allocations

1977-78 SUBPART 3

DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Approved Federal Budget:

Total Funds Claimed:

District Name:

During 1977-78 your district had a Vocational Education Act Subpart 3 Program Improvement and Supportive Services allocation for Disadvantaged Students. The approved federal budget is shown above. Please complete this questionnaire for that allocation and return it by Monday, March 13, 1982 to Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., 530 Oak Grove Avenue, Room 108, Menlo Park, CA 94025. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Please print your name and title:

2. What is your telephone number?

3a. Records in the State Department of Education indicate that the total funds claimed for this allocation was the amount shown above. Is this amount correct?
Yes ____ No ____

b. If "No," what was the correct total of funds claimed?

4. If the total funds claimed was less than 50% of the approved federal budget shown above, please explain why you did not spend the funds you anticipated.

IF NO FUNDS WERE CLAIMED, PLEASE SKIP REMAINING ITEMS.

5. List below each activity that was actually carried out and partially or fully funded by the Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students allocation. (Please list activities and not purposes, goals, or objectives. Activities are those events carried out to achieve the purpose of the allocation. Examples may be holding a workshop on sex bias for vocational education teachers, providing vocational counseling to disadvantaged students, etc.) (Use back of page if necessary.)

6. Please place an asterisk (*) in front of each of the activities noted in item 5 above which would not have been carried out without the allocation.

7. What effects were directly attributable to the allocation during the funding period?

8. What effects directly attributable to the allocation lasted beyond the funding period?

9. If your districts were audited today, what procedure, documentation, testimony, or other evidence would be available to justify allocation expenditures?

10. Information is needed on the characteristics of vocational education students who received benefits from the Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students allocation. Please complete the table below by entering your best estimate of the number of vocational education students who received benefits. If a group received benefits but you are unable to estimate a number, then enter a question mark (?) in the appropriate cell. If detailed information is unavailable, then please do your best and explain below.

Students characteristic	Number of vocational education students who received benefits					
	Secondary or Postsecondary students					Adult Students
	Disadvantaged	Limited English proficient	Handicapped	Other (specify):	Total	
Male, total						
Migrant						
Native						
Single parent/ homemaker						
Migrant						
Native						
Asian (except Hispanic)						
White (except Hispanic)						
Total						

Will any students data be classified and reported.

11. Please show below your best estimate of the number of district, school, or college personnel who received benefits from the Subpart 3 Disadvantaged Students allocation. If a group received benefits but you are unable to estimate a number, then enter a question mark (?) at the appropriate place.

District, School, or College Personnel	Number of Personnel
Administrative staff	
Instructional staff	
Counseling and guidance staff	
Other (Please specify below:)	
_____	
_____	
_____	

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

The following tables are included in this appendix:

Table No.		Page
B-1	Secondary Schools Participating by Subject 3 Broadcasting Stations Broadcasting Programs	60
B-2	Combined Colleges Participating by Subject 3 Broadcasting Stations Broadcasting Programs	60
B-3	Secondary Schools Participating by Subject 3 Limited English Speaking Students Participating	61
B-4	Combined Colleges Participating by Subject 3 Limited English Speaking Students Participating	61
B-5	Secondary Schools Participating by Subject 3 Handicapped Students Participating	62
B-6	Combined Colleges Participating by Subject 3 Handicapped Students Participating	62
B-7	Secondary Schools Participating by Subject 3 Length Broadcasting Programs, 1978-79	63
B-8	Participating by Subject 3 Educational Television and Counseling Programs	64
B-9	Participating by Subject 3 Personnel Preparing Programs, 1978-79	67
B-10	Participating by Subject 3 Projects in Operation Less Than and Greater, 1978-79	68
B-11	Secondary Schools Participating by Subject 3 Special Programs for the Broadcasting Stations	69
B-12	Combined Colleges Participating by Subject 3 Special Programs for the Broadcasting Stations	69

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
[illegible]	(1)	8	(2)	(5)
[illegible]	9	9	9	9
[illegible]	(2)	(4)	7	8
[illegible]	(6)	(3)	(4)	3
[illegible]	(5)	(2)	(1)	(3)
[illegible]	(5)	(6)	(2)	(8)
[illegible]	(7)	(1)	(1)	(3)
[illegible]	(2)	(2)	1	1

[illegible]

Table 9-5

Additional Voltage Statistics Related to Subpart S
Proposed/Suggested Modified Provisions

Statistic	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	0	0	0	0
[illegible]	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
[illegible]	0	0	0	(0)
[illegible]	0	(0)	0	(0)
[illegible]	(0)	(0)	0	(0)
[illegible]	0	0	0	(0)
[illegible]	0	0	0	(0)
[illegible]	0	0	0	(0)
[illegible]	0	(0)	0	(0)
[illegible]	0	0	0	0

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

Table B-15

Community College Activities Funded by Subpart 3
Limited English Speaking Students Participating

Activity	1977-78		1978-79	
	Total number	Percent (N=62)	Total number	Percent (N=63)
Remedial, compensatory, or precollege academic instruction and guidance services	51	82	57	90
Bilingual or precollege vocational services to students	38	61	41	65
Precollege guidance or tutoring for students	37	60	45	71
Materials, modified, or developed especially for students participating	28	45	41	65
Precollege workshops or conferences for personnel training or development	22	35	35	56
Other activities reported differently	16	26	11	17
No activities reported	5	8	11	17

[1]The percent is based on the number of community college districts that originally funds and reported a subcontract. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an attendance.

Table B-5

Secondary School Activities Funded by Subpart 3
Participating Students Attending

Activity	2021-22 Percentage (95% CI)	2021-22 Number (95% CI)	2016-17 Percentage (95% CI)	2016-17 Number (95% CI)
Implemented, improved, or provided student leadership and pursuits services	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Developed, modified, or developed student leadership and pursuits:				
Activities	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Programs	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Provided student placement services	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Offered or provided reintegration services to students	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Provided aides or tutors for student instruction	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Developed, modified, or developed materials or curriculum for students instruction:				
Materials	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Curriculum	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Provided conferences or conferences for personnel training or development	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Other activities reported infrequently	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
No activities reported	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

[redacted] The percent is based on the number of secondary school districts that claimed the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.

Table B-6

[illegible]

Activity	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	62	79	58	69
[illegible]	1	5	6	11
[illegible]	3	9	5	9
[illegible]	14	18	9	18
[illegible]	8	11	6	9
[illegible]	3	9	5	9
[illegible]	3	9	13	23
[illegible]	13	21	3	10
[illegible]	5	9	1	3

[illegible] percent is based on the number of community college districts that offered the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an [illegible].

Table 9-7

Secondary School Activities Funded by Subpart 3
Local Administration Allocations

Activity	Fiscal years	1978-79 Percent[a] (N=43)
Provided administrative services, including paying salary for coordinator, etc.	0	56
Conducted a survey of dropouts (including examining records for one follow-up)	0	44
Paid for release time	0	28
Purchased equipment or supplies	0	44
Other activities reported (afterschool)	0	47
No activities reported	0	0

[a]The percent is based on the number of secondary school districts that visited the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.

Table 6-8

Activities Funded by Subpart 3
Vocational Guidance and Counseling Allocations, 1978-79

Activity	Secondary School Districts: Frequency	Secondary School Districts: Percent[a] (N=123)	Community College Districts: Frequency	Community College Districts: Percent[a] (N=13)
Recruited students or promoted program or services	5	5	6	10
Implemented, improved, or provided student counseling and guidance services	70	68	51	84
Acquired, modified, or developed student counseling and guidance:				
Materials	66	64	10	31
Equipment	20	19	4	7
Provided student placement services	8	8	4	7
Provided workshops or conferences for personnel training or development	30	29	14	24
Provided clerical help	7	6	7	11
Other activities reported infrequently	16	16	3	5
No activities reported	6	6	1	2

[a]The percent is based on the number of districts that claimed the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.

Table 9-8

Activities Funded by Subpart 3
Personnel Training Allocations, [illegible]

Activity	Secondary Schools: Frequency	Secondary Schools: Percent[a] (N=[illegible])	Community Colleges: Frequency	Community Colleges: Percent[a] (N=[illegible])
Acquired, modified, or developed materials for student instruction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Provided personnel training or development services or activities:				
Workshops or conferences	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Hours or visits	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Acquired, modified, or developed personnel training materials	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other activities reported infrequently	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
No activities reported	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[a]The percent is based on the number of districts that claimed the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.

Table B-10

Activities Funded by Subpart 3
Grants to Desegregate Law Rigs and Counseling, 1970-71

Activity	Secondary Schools Frequency	Secondary Schools Percent* (Rank)	Community Colleges Frequency	Community Colleges Percent* (Rank)
Implemented, improved, or provided student counseling and guidance services	1	11	3	43
Obtained, modified, or developed student counseling and guidance materials (Brochures and catalogs were reviewed and revised.)	1	11	10	48
Provided workshops or conferences for personnel training or development	0	0	12	57
Conducted a survey or evaluation (including examining materials for use following)	0	0	6	15
Other activities reported infrequently	3	33	0	0
No activities reported	0	0	1	5

*The percent is based on the number of districts that claimed the funds and returned the questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.

Table B-11

Secondary School Activities Funded by Subpart 4
Special Programs for the Disadvantaged Allocations

Activity	1977-78 Frequency	1977-78 Percent[a] (N=80)	1978-79 Frequency	1978-79 Percent[a] (N=62)
Implemented, improved, or provided student counseling and guidance services	13	16	12	19
Offered or provided instructional services to students	19	24	11	18
Provided personnel for student instruction:				
Teachers	4	5	3	5
Aides or tutors	39	49	32	52
Obtained, modified, or developed materials or equipment for student instruction:				
Materials	19	24	18	29
Equipment	10	12	9	15
Other activities reported infrequently	10	12	8	13
No activities reported	7	9	2	3

[a]The percent is based on the number of secondary school districts that claimed the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.

Table B-12

Community College Activities Funded by Subpart 4 Special Programs for the Disadvantaged Allocations

Activity	1977-78 Frequency	1977-78 Percent[a] (N=24)	1978-79 Frequency	1978-79 Percent[a] (N=21)
Implemented, improved, or provided student counseling and guidance services	8	33	2	10
Offered or provided instructional services to students (instructional and academic support)	12	50	17	81
Provided aides or tutors for student instruction	11	46	9	43
Obtained, modified, or developed materials or equipment for student instruction:				
Materials	6	25	11	52
Equipment	3	12	2	10
Provided clerical help	2	8	1	5
Other activities reported infrequently	4	17	2	10
No activities reported	0	0	0	0

[a]The percent is based on the number of community college districts that claimed the funds and returned a questionnaire. The sum of the percentages exceeds 100 since some districts reported multiple activities for an allocation.